

LA 212

.R5





“The Old School and the New.”

AN ADDRESS

Delivered before the Berks County
Teachers' Institute,

IN THE ACADEMY OF MUSIC,
READING, PA.,

October 26, 1908.

3
3 3 3
3 3 3
3 3 3

BY

LOUIS RICHARDS, Esq.

LA 212
R5

Gift

DeB. R. Keim

7 D '78

c
c
c
c
c
c

“The Old School and the New.”

Mr. Superintendent, Teachers of Berks County, Ladies and Gentlemen :

“In every department of knowledge there always exists, and, since knowledge is progressive, always will exist, old and new schools of thought. Old theories of philosophy and science are being constantly held up to the light of investigation, and tested in the crucible of reason and truth. Throughout all this evolution of things true progress is impossible if it ignores certain basic conditions in human existence which must always be reckoned with if the natural order is to be preserved and development shall not result in chaos.

“Applying this thought to the education of the intellect, there stands out in characters of indelible impress the fundamental truth, expressive of the wisdom of ages, that ‘There is no royal road to learning.’ ‘Nulla gloria sine pulvere,’ said the ancients, and the triumphs in the mental like those in the physical arena, are not to be attained without the dust, the toil and the sweat incident to the struggle for success in the race. This thought will furnish the keynote of what I may have to say in your presence concerning the noble cause in which you are enlisted—the cause of public education.

“There is a quaint interest in recalling the oddities which characterized the first introduction of schools into this State. The primitive conditions and conceptions of popular education which then prevailed are, in this day of advance in equipment and enlightenment in methods, curious reminders of a by-gone time. The contrast between the past and the present is, figuratively speaking, as that between the rush light and the modern incandescent. Were there time to do so, it would be diverting to the generation of teachers of today, accustomed to the environment of modern palatial school buildings and appointments, to picture the primitive log school houses in which the education of our forefathers was begun and finished. Neither the health nor the comfort of the pupils was con-

sidered in the construction of these juvenile penitentiaries. Their outfit was suggestive of the barns and stables of the pioneers rather than that of temples of science. The course of study was limited to the merest elementary branches, of which the three R's constituted in most cases the sum total.

"Of uniformity of text books there could be none, since each pupil provided himself with whatever books could be furnished to him out of the heirlooms of the family at home. For the same reason recitations were conducted singly and not by classes. In reading, the Testament was the highest text book; arithmetic was usually pursued no farther than the four fundamental rules—the single rule of three being considered as the capstone of mathematical instruction. Grammar and geography had no place in the system, these being relegated to the academies and seminaries. The copy books, made of foolscap, began with the pot hooks and ended with the sentences of wisdom inscribed by the master, whose duty it was to mend the pens of the imitative learners. Lessons were got by rote and recited from memory, the same system being employed with the bigger pupils as with the little abecedarians. The boys had the advantage of the superior training—such as it was—for it was commonly regarded as useless to teach the girls anything more than to read, write and spell. To teach them mathematics was thought unnecessary, imprudent even, as tending to an unbecoming masculinity of character. The masters of the day—no one then heard of female teachers—were usually despots, and ruled by fear; impressing their lessons upon the backs of their pupils in order to fix them more firmly in their minds. Their own acquirements were in most cases very limited, and their pay proportioned to their qualifications.

"Not to tarry along the picturesque features of the early schools, I proceed to the subject of the institution of the system in our own county, as matter of local interest, as well as to correct some misrepresentations relative to the causes of the local opposition which it at first encountered. In the universal popular approval at this day of education at the public expense, it is easy, by citing some isolated facts, to pervert history to the undue disadvantage of the Pennsylvania Germans in their original attitude to the system. As I am not of their stock, I cannot be accused of a disposition, arising out of racial pride, unduly to magnify

their qualities and deeds, as a component part of the citizenship of the Commonwealth. My treatment of the subject, therefore, is to be received, I trust, as the more impartial.

"In the Colonial period, the educational movement originated with the Quakers, the dominant element in the settlement and government of Pennsylvania, and always foremost in projects of enlightenment and philanthropy. The earliest seat of learning was, of course, the growing city of Philadelphia, where a college was founded in 1753. Up to the Revolutionary period schools in the rural counties were few and isolated. For the most part they were of parochial connection. In association with their meeting houses in Exeter, in Maidencreek and in Reading, the Friends maintained schools for secular instruction open to children of every faith. The German immigrants who overspread this immediate section of the State, brought with them the parochial school system, implanting it from the beginning in their church establishments in their newly-found homes. Principally of the Lutheran and Reformed faiths, they maintained, in connection with all their churches, schools for the young of their congregations, the primary object of which was to teach them to read the Bible and the catechism. With the latter in particular, the children were required to familiarize themselves as a preliminary to confirmation. The teacher was in some cases the minister, but more frequently the organist and choirmaster, who commonly resided upon a part of the church property. Many of the proprietary land grants for churches were for church schools as well. In some instances their establishment was aided by public lotteries. The Moravians had a school in Oley for both boarders and day scholars, founded in 1743. The Catholics founded a school at their mission house at Goshenhoppen, now Bally, then in Hereford township, about the same time. It was undenominational, in the sense that, though primarily for religious instruction, the young of the neighborhood were admitted without regard to faith. The parochial schools in the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Reading, in Oley, in the Tulpehocken region, in Richmond and Maxatawny townships were maintained for some years after the inauguration of the common school system.

"During the Colonial period, when the chief energies of the settlers were employed in the clearing of the forests

and the subduing of the soil, their children were early trained to hard work, and their education was regarded as of little comparative importance. Illiterate themselves, their elders were indifferent to the mental training of their offspring. During the Revolution, when even the Courts of Justice suspended their regular sessions, and the resources of the country were exhausted by frequent and heavy taxation, school instruction was necessarily in abeyance.

"At a later period neighborhood schools sprang up here and there, through the liberality of individuals, who donated an acre or two of their land to trustees, to hold for educational use. These trustees built the school houses, supplied the fuel and hired some person to teach at such compensation as he could secure from the parents of children sent to him for instruction. The privilege of sending scholars was extended to all persons contributing a few shillings toward the erection and support of the school. The teachers were usually foreigners; itinerants of no fixed residence; some of them tolerably well qualified for their duties, and others notably deficient, or of irregular habits. The school terms were limited to the months in which no farm labor could be employed, the pupils studied what they liked, acquired knowledge in a desultory way, and after attendance of two or three winters their education was considered as finished. The government of the school was almost invariably despotic and tyrannical, and the elementary training which the scholars received was imparted through many pains and penalties. The best teachers were the Yankees, as those from New England were called, and the Irish; some of the latter being educated men, and thorough instructors. They particularly excelled in mathematics, a branch which they taught without the aid of text books, where none could be procured. The subscription school houses, as a rule, passed at a later date, by legislation, into the hands of the directors of the common school districts. The evidence of the existence of many of these early schools is ascertainable only by the record of the land titles of the county; that of others by fast fading tradition.

"In 1810 the Legislature passed an Act providing that all masters or mistresses of German redemptioners who were minors, should give them six weeks schooling for every year during their term of servitude, and that this provision should be inserted in their indentures.

"The earliest interest displayed by the State in public education was evidenced in the incorporation and endowment of numerous academies. Many of these institutions were eminently successful in their earlier periods and furnished an educational training equal to that obtainable in the colleges of the day. They continued to multiply, both before and after the establishment of the common school system. This county had a liberal share of them.

"That at Reading was incorporated in 1788. It was liberally endowed by the State, both in money and lands. Its affairs were committed to a Board of Trustees composed of leading citizens, and for some years it flourished under the charge of eminent instructors. Through inefficiency of management, its usefulness became much impaired, and in 1850 its property was sold to the Reading School District. In its building at Fourth and Court streets was established the Reading High School. In 1834 an academy was established at Womelsdorf, in 1839 one at Stouchsburg and another at Rehrersburg; in 1840 one at Bernville and another at Hamburg; in 1844 one at Maiden creek, and in 1857 one at Friedensburg. Unincorporated academies were established at Boyertown in 1822, at Morgantown in 1827, and at Kutztown and Unionville in 1840.

"The town of Reading was well supplied with schools long before the organization of the common school system. In 1829 infant schools were established in the borough by some philanthropic ladies, for the tuition of pupils from 18 months to 8 years of age. The charge for tuition was \$1 per quarter, and for poor children 50 cents per quarter. The destitute were taught gratis. The instruction given was necessarily of the most elementary character, and the girls were taught needlework. It received some support from the county, and its sessions were held in the old county building at Fifth and Penn streets, where an undenominational Sunday School had been organized about the same time. The history of the numerous private schools and seminaries in existence in Reading at different times during the first half of the last century would fill a volume, and constitute an abundant testimonial to the appreciation by this community of the value of education.

"The forerunner of the common or free school system in this State was embodied in the act of 1809, entitled 'An act

to provide for the education of the poor gratis.' By its provisions the assessors of each district of the counties were required to return to the County Commissioners the names of all children between the ages of 5 and 12 whose parents were unable to pay for their schooling, and upon a report thereof, the parents were authorized to send their children to the most convenient school free of expense. The teachers were directed to keep an account of the number of days such children attended, and of all stationery furnished for their use, and to render a sworn statement of the expense, at the usual rates of charge, to the County Commissioners, which sums the latter were required to pay. This law was in force for a period of upwards of 25 years, but the distinction which it made between the rich and the poor nullified to a great extent its benevolent intention. The majority of parents who were in straitened circumstances preferred keeping their children at home rather than accept the alms of the State for their instruction. In this county the law does not seem to have been so unpopular as in many others. The county accounts for a period of 20 years subsequent to 1809 show expenditures for this purpose of upwards of \$15,000.

"This scheme was succeeded by that established by the law of 1834, which was the foundation of the present common school system. Regular State appropriations were to be made for the support of free schools, to be conducted under the management of boards of local directors, and the general supervision vested in the Secretary of the Commonwealth, who was constituted Superintendent of Common Schools. To become entitled to a share of the State appropriation each district was to collect an annual tax of double the amount of such share. The crucial feature of the system was the provision that its acceptance or non-acceptance was left to the voters of each district.

"Now began the battle royal between the friends and foes of universal popular education. The storm of opposition which prevailed throughout almost the entire State has rendered this the most notable epoch in its educational history. The poorer classes were generally in favor of the system, but the rich upon whom the burden of taxation was to rest, voted it is said with few exceptions against it. The scheme was denounced as aristocratic, unjust and an unwarrantable infringement upon private rights. It was certain, said some, to make the rising generation proud,

effeminate and idle. The Legislature at its next session, was flooded with petitions for its repeal, but though several amendments were made to the act during the two succeeding years, the system was maintained in its entirety.

"From the report of the Secretary of the Commonwealth for 1835, it appeared that the number of school districts in Berks was 34, and that of the latter two only had accepted. These were the borough of Reading and the township of Caernarvon. As evidence of the temper of the people, anti-school meetings were held in several sections of the county, at which resolutions were adopted denouncing in Declaration of Independence fashion the law as oppressive, unequal in its operation, creating unnecessary offices, trespassing upon the right of control by parents over the labor of their children, striking a dangerous blow at the foundation of free government, etc. At a little later date liberty poles were erected in some of the rural districts inscribed 'no free schools.' Two of the members of the Legislature from the county, who had voted for the law of 1834, were defeated on that ground for re-election the following year. Politicians made profitable use of the popular prejudice to serve their own ends. The town of Reading promptly put the free schools into operation, with a degree of success which afforded a significant object lesson to the people at large of the necessity of the system.

"The attitude of the people of our county toward the inauguration of the common school law has often been made the occasion of an attack upon the citizenship of that day, reflecting upon their intelligence and public spirit. But the facts of history show most clearly that they stood by no means alone in their sentiment of opposition. Hostility to the law was well nigh general throughout the State. By the report of the Auditor General for 1835, it appears that but 19 out of the 50 counties of Penn'a had accepted the school law, in whole or in part, and drawn their appropriations. In distant communities in which the Penn'a German element was practically unknown the opposition to the law was equally violent and bitter. Of the petitions for repeal of the Act of 1834 presented to the Legislature of 1835, there were 60 from Berks and 82 from Lancaster, each containing upwards of 3,000 names, and 40 from Chester, containing upwards of 2,000 names. In counties beyond the Allegheny Mountains the pressure for repeal was equally strong in particular sections.

"Thus it appears that the action of our people at that period was specially significant neither of race nor locality. Their arraignment therefore as conspicuous offenders against light and knowledge is manifestly undue and unjust.

"The majority of the people at large thought that the law of 1809 for the schooling of the children of the poor was going far enough. As has been seen, Berks county at that period was fairly well provided with neighborhood subscription schools as well as academies, and the parochial system was in full operation. Her people's characteristic aversion to change was undoubtedly a potent factor in shaping their action, and the new law was regarded even by some of its friends as a somewhat doubtful experiment. In the Legislature itself, it is to be noted, the Act of 1834 narrowly escaped repeal in the following year. It was upon this memorable date that Thaddeus Stevens made his eloquent appeal for the preservation of the system, in the face of the fact cited by its opponents that the State was in debt, and that the school appropriation for the first year had taken out of the treasury for the benefit of the few, the munificent sum of nearly \$30,000!

"What would the doubting legislative solons of that day have said could they have foreseen the time when the State would expend for free schools in a single year upwards of \$6,000,000—when the army of children attending them would reach 1,500,000—when public education would not only be free but compulsory, and every school child be required to be vaccinated? Surely they would have exclaimed, as with one mighty voice—'God Save the Commonwealth!'

"With reference to the resolutions adopted at this period at the opposition meetings held in this county, before referred to, too much emphasis must not be laid upon them as expressions of the general popular opinion. Their rhetorical style seems to indicate that they were the work of a professional hand; possibly the same in each case. Whilst they were passed apparently without opposition by the meetings, their radical utterances may, as is not uncommon on such occasions, have reflected the special animus of their authors. Some of the clergy, who were specially influential leaders of public opinion in the rural districts, and who openly declared themselves as opponents of the law, were influenced in their attitude by the belief

that the secular schools would impair the influence of the parochial. As the preaching throughout the county was then exclusively in the German language, they thought, moreover, they foresaw in the establishment of English schools the decline of the prevalence of the native tongue.

"A meeting of the citizens of Reading held in the Court House quite as vigorously upheld the law as the harbinger of the poor man's rights, and repudiated the criticism that the working portion of the community might become too well informed. Within three weeks after the opening of the borough schools, 1,200 children crowded into them, 500 of whom had never been in any school. In 1838 the first public school building in Reading was erected at the southwest corner of Sixth and Walnut streets, within a stone's throw of where we are now assembled. The County Commissioners received from the State in 1835, for the use of the two accepting districts the sum of \$3,000; the counties of Berks and Allegheny being entitled to the largest share of the fund.

"The struggle against the school law of 1834 was protracted, both here and in different other parts of the State for a period of more than 20 years, down to and beyond the adoption of the act of 1854, upon which the present system is principally based. Various amendments to the old law were in the meantime adopted, as experience suggested. As the great benefits of the system were demonstrated, opposition to it gradually abated. Township after township fell into line, and it was notable that some of the bitterest opposers of the scheme at the beginning became in the course of time its most ardent and sincere supporters. The bounty of the State increased from year to year, out of which the accepting districts were enabled, with the proceeds of the local taxes, to build school houses, employ teachers, and demonstrate to their backward neighbors the practical benefits of the system. What might have been accomplished in a different state of public opinion, was evidenced by the fact that in the year 1848, there were still in the State Treasury undrawn school appropriations due to the county of Berks, of \$82,500. In that year the Local Option feature of the school law was removed, and the system made compulsory in every district of the State. In some of the townships of the county directors elected refused to open the schools, as the law required, and in several cases applications were made to the court by the

friends of the law for its enforcement, the directors turned out for neglect of duty and others appointed.

"On December 26, 1849, the first County Convention of School Directors was held in the Reading Academy building, at which representatives from nine districts were present. John S. Richards, a member of the Bar, and a most zealous and aggressive champion of the cause of public education, presided. A committee was appointed to secure the refunding to the several districts of the undrawn shares of the State appropriation due to the county, then about to merge, by act of the Legislature into the treasury. A committee on school books was also appointed, and meetings of the teachers suggested to be held, for mutual improvement in their calling. The condition of things existing at the time of the introduction of common schools into the county is illustrated by the fact that 300 new school houses were found necessary to accommodate the children, 200 of which were provided up to the year 1855.

"The election of County Superintendents provided for by the law of 1854, signalized a most important advance in the progress of the common school system. Before this no properly graded schools were in existence, and no examinations into the qualifications of teachers held, other than those made by the local Boards of Directors, or by persons selected by them. County Institutes, local and district institutes and conventions of directors, which were subsequently inaugurated, promoted the improvement of the system in proportion to its rapidly increasing extension.

"I have been thus minute in tracing the history of public education in our own county in order that the youthful and enthusiastic teachers of today may profit by the reminder of what it cost to originate and establish it. As administrators of the system, I trust they may also derive from the same source encouragement and inspiration in the discharge of their most important duties. Would that the youth of this generation in general, by whom the benefits of free instruction in knowledge are being enjoyed, were correspondingly appreciative of the value of their inestimable privileges.

"So much for the old schools; what of the new? With an experience of three-quarters of a century of public school education it might be supposed that by this time

the system would be well nigh perfect. How far have results borne out the designs and hopes of its founders? To this question it would be difficult to frame an answer satisfactory to the majority. There is at this time almost as great a divergence of views upon the science of education as there is upon those of theology or medicine, or the ever-changing platforms of political parties. Upon this disputed ground I should fear to enter, were it not for some very significant recent utterances of distinguished educators, whose views are entitled to attention and respect.

"Colonel Charles W. Larned, Professor at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and a member of its Executive Board, in a paper published in the *North American Review*, referring to the results of the preliminary examinations for admission to that institution the present year, cites the discouraging fact, as a test of public school efficiency, that out of 314 applicants examined mentally, 295 of whom had been educated in the public schools in 10 different States, 265 failed in one or more subjects, 209 in two or more subjects, and 26 failed in everything. The subjects upon which they were examined were elementary algebra, plane geometry, English grammar, English literature and composition, United States history, general history, and geography—all included in the common school curriculum. The minimum mark allowed in any subject was 66 out of a possible 100. From Pennsylvania 11 out of 17 failed to pass—a proportion not materially varying from that of candidates from New York and Massachusetts. 'The result,' he says, 'indicates a great weakness in our methods of instruction, which shows a vast waste of time on the part of a great portion of the student body.'

"Said Andrew L. Draper, LL. D., Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, within the past two months, before the National Association of Educators: 'The programmes in the elementary schools are too much overloaded, too crowded and too complex, and the teachers are overtaxed. There is too much pedagogy and too little teaching—too much artificial and too little real culture—too many text books and too many visionary appliances. A little information is given about everything, and no exact efficiency about anything. We do not lay the first course of the building with sufficient exactness and strength. The theorists carry associations of teachers into pedagogical ecstasies and hysteria.'

“Said Dr. Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton University, in the present month, in dwelling upon the theme of college life: ‘The courses of study in the schools have ceased to be courses at all, and have degenerated into a mixed mass of subjects, meant to serve every interest and every utility of modern life. The college has been given the same patternless variety of makeup and purpose. There has been a general breakup of types and standards, and all consistent plans have suffered a common dissolution. It is not athletics which is to blame. The exaggeration of athletics is a mere incidental symptom and not the disease at all. Look closer and you will find scores of other organizations: social organizations; organizations for whist, for politics, for keeping former schoolmates together, for eating together, for living together, and for everything that interests and is susceptible of organization.’

“This is incisive language, and the sum of these opinions points to one conclusion, which is that the curriculum of the public schools has become too diversified for beneficial results—too profuse in the branches which more appropriately belong to the college course, and—most significant of all—too neglectful of the elementary studies which lie at the basis of a good English education. The demand for ‘higher education’ has, in the opinion of many, set the standard so high as to be beyond the reach of the average pupil. Like food, education, to be serviceable, must be assimilated. The doctors tell us that all the food we take that cannot be properly digested is so much poison to the system. So the cramming process in the schools leads to the congestion of the heterogeneous matter, which, if not positively harmful to the mind, is to say the least of no lasting benefit.

“The experience of all of us whose school days are long past, is suggestive upon the last point. If we ask ourselves how much of the so-called higher branches of our school studies we are able to remember even—let alone to apply—how meagre will be the quotient.

“It has seemed to me that in the fixing of the schedule of studies and the selection of text books, the learned professors upon whom this duty devolves make the adjustment as if to suit their own mature capacities rather than those of their inexperienced pupils. The demand for these higher standards has this fallacy, that it proposes to do too much in too short a period. The school life of today is

thus made too complex. We are in danger of mistaking the gloss and the tinsel of superficiality for solid and serviceable achievements. The public school trenches too much upon the province of the higher academies and colleges. It is difficult for the pupil of 50 years ago to recognize even the nomenclature of many of the branches taught today. How far indeed has the modern idea of the scope of the common school education removed from the standard set up by its founders. Said the Hon. Thomas H. Burrowes, the first Superintendent of common schools, in 1845: 'The object of the system and all the legislation relative to it, is to bestow the rudiments of a plain and useful education in the schools, at the common charge, and upon a footing of perfect equality upon the children of all the inhabitants of the State, without respect to class or degree.' Mark the emphasis upon the rudiments. Are they not now being too much lost sight of in the pursuit of higher grades? The task of education, it must be admitted, grows more difficult and complex as time advances. But the foundations—the essentials—must always remain the same. Unless the foundations are laid deep and broad the superstructure will always be insecure. Education can neither be sterilized nor diluted. Whether a pupil enters an institution of a higher grade or not, he should leave the public school with an education complete in itself in all that concerns the fundamentals. Much of the old-fashioned training it must be conceded was conventional and bookish merely. But it was robust and thorough, so far as it went; and this is its crowning merit. The scholar in the higher grades today ought to know everything that was taught his grandparents 50 years ago, and know it thoroughly, as well. If he is to mount successfully the higher steps of the hill of science, he must constantly retrace those at the bottom. The General of the army must never forget the manual of arms. The beginner in music is not set to work upon symphonies and sonatas, and the finished performer must know all the notes at sight, and practice his scales daily.

"The importance of the study of English cannot be over-rated. He who would be proficient in it must be able to read, write and speak it correctly. How many students who have left school do not possess the ability to express with accuracy and conciseness, orally or in writing, even a single train of thought. The study of the Latin and

Greek, in so far at least as it serves to acquire the etymology of our own language, is indispensable to the English scholar. Wide but carefully chosen reading—an acquaintance with some of the masterpieces of prose and verse—and systematic exercises in composition are important adjuncts to literary taste and culture.

“Much attention is now sought to be directed to manual training as a part of the public school curriculum. So zealous indeed have its advocates become in their claims for its recognition, that they are even prone to speak disparagingly of what they term mere mental culture in comparison with it. Says one who combines high functions of state with the regulation of the domestic economy of the people: ‘Our school system is gravely defective in so far as it puts a premium upon mere literary training, and tends therefore to train the boy away from the farm and the workshop. Nothing is more needed than the best type of industrial school—the school for mechanical industries in the city, the school for practically teaching agriculture in the country.’ Of what use, it is asked, that our schools turn out educated men, if they are not competent to earn their living? The idea has sprung out of the prevailing commercialism of the age in which we live. The answer is, that intellectual training is one thing and manual training is another. Both cannot be taught thoroughly in the limited period of school life. The public school is first and foremost the forum for the training of the mind, a training which even the intelligent mechanic cannot slight or dispense with. Technical education with practical and useful results can only be acquired in the scientific institutions which teach it. To convert the class room into a carpenter shop or machine shop is, therefore, in my humble view, a waste of time, and a perversion of the principal design of common school instruction. In my day in the public schools manual training extended no farther than the whittling of the desks by the boys and the cutting out of paper dolls by the girls. In this elementary feature the pupils were self-instructed, and it was carried on not under the supervision of the teacher, but in spite of it. How little does the pupil of 12 or 15 know what manual occupation he is best fitted for? How little does the teacher know, and what qualifications has he as mechanical instructor? How would the skilled workman regard the output of the student of manual training in the public schools? Would he recog-

nize him as a fellow craftsman and admit him to the 'union?' The theory of manual training has not as yet, I believe, obtained much hold in the country schools. In the rural districts such training may indeed profitably be applied to many departments of agriculture and domestic economy, but out of school hours and under the direction of the parents of the pupils.

"There remains no time to dwell upon the high importance of moral as well as intellectual training in the public schools. Here is truly a wide field for the activities of educators and philanthropists. The most important end of education is character building. Technology is of little value in comparison with it. Under present day conditions the attention of instructors may well be specially directed to the relations of public school training to the development of the character of the individual pupil, to his training not only in morals, but in the knowledge also of the principles of civil government, and his preparation for the proper discharge of the duties of good citizenship.

"But I am forgetting the due limitations of my paper in the immensity of the subject. In these commentaries upon common school education I only contend for what I believe to be safe and sane ideas upon this much discussed problem. Without disparaging the great progress everywhere being made in the art of teaching I would not lose sight of fundamental principles, of perpetual importance in their application.

"In conclusion I can but assure you that I have a full appreciation of the cares and perplexities of the conscientious teacher, and that for his or her calling I have the most profound respect. Let me but express the hope that you may never be weary of your work, though you often be weary in it; ever sustained and stimulated by a pervading sense of the importance of the interests committed to your charge."





JUNE 79



N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 886 495 A